



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

out of the difference of language and of methods of doing business, and in part out of radical difference of opinion on certain questions of the day which were discussed. Certain Italian delegates undertook to justify before the Congress the course which a section of the Italian pacifists had followed in supporting Italy's attack upon Turkey in Tripoli. Demonstrations of strong opposition immediately appeared, in which a very large portion of the Congress joined, and the uproar became so great that the speakers were compelled to give up trying to make themselves heard. Even this uproar, unseemly as it seemed to some, revealed in its way the intense hatred of war which is developing more and more among the European peoples. It was a gratification to learn that much the larger portion of the Italian pacifists had remained loyal to their peace professions, and those of this party present condemned the war against Turkey and the attempt to justify it as strongly as anybody else in the Congress. When the question of Morocco and of Egypt came up there was also some disorder, but nothing of any serious character. Many members of the peace party in different countries have thought that such questions should be excluded from the Peace Congress as being exclusively national questions. Others feel that most of these questions have an international side, and that the friends of peace should insist on justice being done to the aspirations of semi-independent peoples, and thus causes of illwill and of possible war be removed. This latter view has more and more developed in the peace congresses, and this year this class of subjects threatened at one time to consume the whole time of the sessions.

It must not be inferred from the notices which appeared in some of the American papers that the Congress was a bear-garden, in which the animals were daily at each other's throats. Nothing of the sort was true. Lively and exciting as were some of the discussions, a spirit of good feeling and fairness generally prevailed, and the Congress closed in the best of temper all round.

The interest and value of the Congress were much increased by the public meetings, receptions, concerts, and excursions which were organized in connection with it. In these the delegates extended their acquaintance and cultivated and deepened their sense of unity and fellowship.

The Committee on Organization gave the delegates a warm reception, with tea and speeches, at the Athénée on Sunday evening before the formal opening on Monday. The reception, which was most cordial and made the delegates feel at home, was held in the room in which the Red Cross Convention had its birth. On Monday afternoon a visit to prominent historic sites in the city was made by the delegates under the guidance of those "who knew." On Monday evening an organ concert was given the delegates in the Cathedral. On Tuesday afternoon a reception was given the Congress by the city authorities at the Ariana, a fine museum and park in the outskirts of the city. Tuesday evening a public meeting was held in the University Hall, at which exceptionally fine addresses were delivered by

Senator La Fontaine, of Belgium, and Dr. Charles Richet, of the University of Paris. On Wednesday evening a concert was given in Victoria Hall by the musical societies of Geneva, at which an eloquent and powerful peace address was delivered by Madame Sévérine, the distinguished woman journalist of Paris. The whole day Thursday was devoted to a grand tour of the lake, in which nearly all of the delegates participated. The tour included a visit to the famous old Castle of Chillon, and a reception at Ouchy, the port of Lausanne, by the Vaudoise Peace Society. On the return to Geneva in the evening the excursionists were welcomed back by a grand illumination of the bridges and quays. On Friday evening a meeting was held in the great hall of the *Maison Communale de Plainpalais*, at which fine music was rendered by two of the leading musical societies of Geneva and addresses were delivered by Dr. G. B. Clark for England, Dr. L. Quidde for Germany, Mr. Emile Arnaud for France, and Benjamin F. Trueblood for the United States. The great audience was made up nearly entirely of members of the Geneva Section of the Swiss Peace Society, who had been specially invited.

In the same hall, which was tastefully decorated for the occasion, the closing banquet of the Congress took place on Saturday at 1 o'clock. During the banquet a number of telegrams addressed to the Congress were read by Professor Favre, chairman of the Committee on Organization. Brief remarks were made by Mr. Arnaud, Senator La Fontaine, Madame Sévérine, and others. Mr. Henri Fazy, president of the Swiss State Council, urged the pacifists to endeavor to create in their different countries an increasingly strong public opinion in favor of peace. Mr. Quartier-la Tente, the president of the Congress, who presided over the meetings with dignity, tact, and impartiality, in closing the Congress expressed his great appreciation of the peace movement and his hope for its entire success.

Further interesting details will be found in our Notes on the Congress.

President Taft's Services to the Cause of International Peace.

The American Peace Society is not affiliated with any political party. It would not be true to its ancient principles, however, were it to pass unnoticed at this time President William Howard Taft's services in behalf of international fraternity. These services have been conspicuous because of his active repudiation of the intolerable theory of militarism, and because of his earnest and intelligent attempts to vitalize international peace in terms of the concrete.

President Taft is a growing, progressive man in his conceptions of the world's peace and the means by which this is to be established. In May, 1909, he wrote to the Chicago Peace Congress a cordial letter in which, however, he indirectly subscribed to the policy of "excepting

questions of honor and vital interest" from international treaties of arbitration. At that time he strongly subscribed to the Roosevelt naval policy. He has now grown far beyond the "excepting" policy, and while he still subscribes to the policy of an adequate navy, it is with a decreasing emphasis. Trained as a jurist, for four years Secretary of War, acquainted at first hand with the great problems of Pan-America, of Asia, and of Europe, he represents at its best the rapidly growing public sentiment in favor of the cessation of war.

The President is frank enough to define war in such exact terms as "inhuman, illogical, brutal, unsatisfying." He has repeatedly said that while he has "no expectation that war is going to be abolished tomorrow morning," or that "the millennium is coming just after breakfast," and that "movements of this sort must progress very slowly," yet "we should have foresight and intelligence enough to recognize a real step of progress when it is taken." Further, he says: "We shall never dispose of the movement toward armaments and toward increasing armaments until we satisfy the nations who are carrying on this movement merely for self-defense and for the protection of their integrity that there is some other means upon which they can really rely for the settlement of international controversies." He has, therefore, frequently pleaded for an arbitral court into which one nation may summon another nation, and make the nation respond to the judgment of that court. He is the first President to urge that a nation should be willing to surrender something in a controversy and to submit to adjudication all questions, even though they involve "national honor" or "vital interests." His words at Ocean Grove, August 15, 1911, were: "We cannot make omelets without breaking eggs; we cannot submit international questions to arbitration without the prospect of losing."

Coming from the President of the United States, words like the following are also impressive: "To say that you cannot satisfy your honor without shedding a little blood is to go back to the dark ages." . . . "If there ever was a thing that ought to be adjudged, it is a question of honor." The President has frequently pointed out that the "wager of battle" enforced 250 years ago in English courts was no worse than is the principle of international relations today, and yet he insists that there is honor between nations, and that that honor is safe before any impartial tribunal. He believes, further, that might is not in itself right; that the assent of thinking men and women to this greatly needed world reform should now crystallize into an effective international system of legislation, judicial decision, and an executive power which will make unnecessary the present wickedly extravagant drain upon the resources of the nations. He has asserted pointedly that

"it is not true that there must always be war." He recognizes that wars have accomplished much, developed certain high traits of character, but he is not blind to the degrading effects of its "accompanying ambitions," "lusts for power," "cruelties," "ghoulish rapacities," and "corruptions." May 3, 1911, he opened the Third National Peace Congress at Baltimore, becoming thus the first head of a great nation to approve of the peace movement in this way.

But the President has been more than a moralizing philosopher. He has attempted and accomplished large concrete things for the cause of international peace. The expansion of the Bureau of Trade Relations has been not only a means of industrial advance, but of international goodwill. When confronted with the acute situation growing out of the question of Japanese competition with our laborers of the Pacific States, he not only avoided the "competition" by means of a treaty with Japan, but doubled our exports to that country in three years, and brightened perceptibly the chances of an unlimited arbitration treaty between the two countries. By influencing American bankers to participate in the Hukuang loan, and subsequently in the reform of Chinese currency, the friendship of China for the United States was promoted, our exports to that country increased 50 per cent in two years, and international goodwill increased among the concert of great powers in China. It was President Taft's hand that preserved the independence of Liberia and brought back to life that interesting little waif of ours. During the Taft régime Venezuela has sloughed off Castro and enjoyed a fuller measure of peace. Zelaya has fortunately been deposed in Nicaragua and the Emery claim settled. The Aslop case has been disposed of and the troubles of a generation with Chile ended. American leadership has shown Nicaragua the way to financial integrity, and Honduras is about to accept our guidance in its business affairs, as has Santo Domingo. The boundary dispute between Panama and Costa Rica has been settled through the influence of the United States. The whole Central American situation has been spared further encroachments of Zelayanism by our Government's recent stand for orderly government in that section. A "United States of Central America" is appreciably nearer because of the Taft policy of Pan-American friendship and goodwill. President Taft's self-restraint before the turmoils of the Republic of Mexico has subserved the interests of 40,000 of our people residing in that country and been an inspiration to all Christian civilization. In conjunction with Argentina and Brazil he has been able to prevent war between Haiti and Santo Domingo, and to stop the onrush of civil war in Honduras. War in Cuba has been forestalled by vigorous warnings from our Government. The fisheries dispute with Great Britain, dragging down

through two generations, has been settled at The Hague. The Passamaquoddy Bay dispute has been arbitrated, and the seal fisheries disputes between our country, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia have at last been settled without a hint of arms. Three tantalizing cases have been satisfactorily settled with Venezuela. A boundary dispute between our country and Mexico has been referred to a commission. A treaty of arbitration covering ancient pecuniary claims between the United States and Great Britain has been ratified. The Taft administration has been indefatigable in promoting the International Court of Prize and the International Court of Arbitral Justice, the former a supreme court of war and the latter a supreme court of peace, both of which are all but established.

In addition, there are the well-known arbitration treaties, one with Great Britain and the other with France, signed August 3, 1911. President Taft proposed these treaties in the fall of 1910 as an example to all nations. They were drawn with the coöperation of Ambassadors Bryce and Jusserand. The President pleaded for them in thirty different States. They were enthusiastically endorsed abroad. They represented the high-water mark of the statecraft of a generation. They were emasculated and passed by a quibbling United States Senate. They will yet be passed in substantially their original form, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. From the standpoint of international relations, President William Howard Taft seems to us to be a progressive of the progressives.

End of the War in Tripoli.

The war between Italy and Turkey is over. Everybody is glad of it. It ought never to have been. No other war of modern times has been so universally condemned by the public conscience as unjust and entirely without reason. It has been openly and justly denounced as an act of pure national brigandage. Italy has lowered herself by it before the whole civilized world. That she has measurably succeeded and wrested from Turkey sovereignty over the region fought for does not in the least change the moral character of her conquest. There is no right of conquest, never has been, and never will be. Conquest belongs to the realm of senseless brute force. It follows the law of might, not of right, and ought to disappear forever from the relations of nations.

The evils of the war have been many. It has had, as every war has, its share of cruelty and savagery on the battlefield. It has pressed the air itself into the service of inhumanity and promiscuous slaughter. It has taken the lives of many men in cold blood. It has cost the Italian government not less than two hundred

million dollars, which must be paid by the toil and suffering of the people, already nearly crushed with taxes and in parts of the country half starving. It has laid up new hatreds and enmities for the future. It has been altogether a melancholy spectacle in the midst of our boasted Christian civilization, and the only good thing about it is its end. In that let us all rejoice, and let us "highly resolve" that, so far as our little influence can effect anything, no such phenomenon shall ever again be witnessed in the relations of races and states.

The treaty of peace was signed by the Italian and Turkish commissioners at Ouchy, Switzerland, on the 18th of October. Whether the terms of agreement are such as will insure peace between the two peoples for the future, time only can determine. Sovereignty over Tripoli and Cyrenaica is ceded by Turkey to Italy. In return Italy is to pay to Turkey an annual indemnity equivalent to the tribute which goes into the Turkish treasury from Tripoli. The Turkish troops and garrisons are to be withdrawn from Tripoli. Italy agrees to evacuate the islands which she has taken in the Ægean Sea on condition that the Porte grants civil and religious liberty to its Christian inhabitants. The Sultan is to retain his spiritual headship over the Mohammedan inhabitants of Libya.

The Balkan War.

It ought not to surprise any one that war has at last broken out between the Balkan states and Turkey. The real wonder is that the conflict did not come many years ago. The most ardent advocate of peace does not expect that war can be avoided where injustice and tyranny in their worst forms are practiced systematically and continued over long periods of time.

But the appeal to the sword is always an uncertain one. It is impossible to say at the present moment whether the course which the Balkan states have taken will leave their condition better or worse. History tells a very pathetic story in matters of this kind. In a contest of brute force it is always the stronger, all things considered, who wins. The Turkish army has always been a terrible fighting machine, and it is difficult to conceive of its being finally defeated and driven from the field by the forces which the small allied states can bring against it.

But even if they should win, it is an infinite pity that war should have been the instrument. All accounts indicate that the fighting is swift and terrible, and that the losses are unusually heavy. Large numbers of the strongest and physically best men of the Balkan states will be slain, and even if they should come out victorious, these peoples will begin their struggle after-